

## II. REMARKS.

In the Office Action, all of pending claims 1-22 were rejected over a primary reference of US Patent 6,670,995 to Morein (the "Morein Patent"); claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Morein, while the remaining rejected claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over the Morein Patent and Schilling, "A New Simple and Efficient Antialiasing with Subpixel Masks" (the "Schilling Article"). Finally, claims 5-7, 10 and 17 were additionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, based upon claim wording issues.

In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims to address the 35 U.S.C. §112 language improprieties addressed by the Examiner, generally implementing the suggestions advanced by the Examiner.<sup>1</sup> It is respectfully submitted that these claim amendments are self-explanatory, and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should now be withdrawn as no longer proper. [This rejection will not be further discussed in the text that follows.]


In response to the rejections over art, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration; as shown by the accompanying Rule 131 declaration of inventor Craig Wittenbrink, the Morein Patent is not prior art to the present invention. As indicated by the accompany declaration, the inventor had fully reduced the present invention to practice on or before November 11, 1999, which precedes the effective filing date of the Morein Patent (July 19, 2000). On November 11, 1999, the inventor submitted in writing materials completely describing the embodiments of the present application and the invention of all claims of the present application. These materials are reproduced as part the declaration of Craig Wittenbrink for the Examiner's review and inspection. Because Applicant invented the subject matter of the present application before July 19, 2000, the Morein Patent does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

---

<sup>1</sup> Importantly, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7 based on alleged language errors in claim 5; Applicant believes the Examiner meant to instead refer to claim 4, line 7, and Applicant has therefore amended this claim in lieu of claim 5.


Importantly, the Examiner has apparently cited the Schilling Article merely for the purpose of contenting that subpixel masks are known generally in rendering processes (and nothing more). It is respectfully submitted that removal of the Morein Patent from the pool of available art requires withdrawal of both the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a), i.e., an obviousness rejection cannot be based on the Schilling Article alone and the allegation that subpixel masks are generally known in the field of rendering.

Respectfully submitted,  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc P. Schuyler  
Reg. No. 35,675

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. §1.8)**

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231 on this 17 December 2004.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc P. Schuyler  
Registration No. 35,675

Dated: 17 December 2004